

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application. Claims 6-9 are allowed. Claims 1-5 are rejected. Claim 1 is currently amended to correct a typographical error.

In his allowance of claims 6-9, the Examiner noted in his reasons for allowance that the use of the term 'composed' in the phrase a 'protective sleeve composed of neodymium' excludes all other elements from being present in the sleeve, and that since the prior art does not disclose a protective sleeve composed of neodymium in elemental form, the claim is allowable.

In the prior amendment, claim 1 was amended to call for the protective sleeve to be 'composed of neodymium'. The only remaining difference between claim 1 and allowable claim 6 is that in claim 6 the light source is a metal halide arc tube. Yet Nelson also relates to a metal halide lamp.


Thus, if claim 6 (and its dependent claims) is allowable, then claim 1 (and its dependent claims) should also be allowable for the same reasons.

The Examiner has provided no reason why claim 1 should be treated differently from claim 6.

Accordingly, it is urged that the rejection of claims 1-5 is in error and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



John C. Fox, Reg. 24,975
Consulting Patent Attorney
203-329-6584